

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 27, 2004 has been fully considered by Applicants. Claims 1, 5, 6 and 7 are currently amended; claims 2-4 have been canceled.

Attached is a revised Figure 1 having more clearly defined lead lines as requested by Examiner Beliveau. No new matter has been added.

The specification has been amended to delete the reference to dotted lines appearing in Figure 1 as suggested by Examiner Beliveau. Applicant appreciates Examiner Beliveau's thorough review of the application.

Claims 5-7 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Claims 5-7 have been amended to overcome this rejection and therefore Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 6 has been amended to overcome the 112 rejection. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 7 has been amended to overcome the 112 rejection and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1-5 and 7 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,585,838 to Lawler et al. in view of United States Patent No. 5,654,748 to Matthews, III.

Regarding Lawler et al, Examiner Beliveau states that:

"As illustrated in Figure 8, the reference illustrates that the cell is operable to display the remaining time in the program. Accordingly, the 'display portion' [108] of Lawler et al does not 'show the time which has elapsed since the program started and/or which will lapse beyond the time period shown before the program ends, but suggests that the 'display portion' [108] is operable to display more detailed information about a selected program (Col 10, Lines 20-22)."

However, the '838 patent to Lawler et al. discloses program schedule information in the form of a program grid and an associated program summary panel that displays more detailed information about a specific program within the grid. In contrast, Applicant's invention, as currently amended, provides a display portion that is generated on the display for each of cell corresponding to one or more programs. This feature is not found or suggested in either the '838 Lawler et al patent nor the '748 Mathews, III patent.

Furthermore, the '748 Mathews, III patent discloses (lines 45-49, Col 5) that,

"the identification panel may also display additional information such as the current time, the time remaining in the program being viewed, the time elapsed in the program being viewed or some other brief information."

It can be seen that in both the '838 Lawler et al and the '748 Matthews, III patents the display of detailed information in relation to only one program at any given time is disclosed. In contrast, Applicant's invention, as currently amended, recites that a "display portion is generated on the display for each of the cells corresponding to the one or more programs...". Applicant's invention, as can be clearly seen, is particularly advantageous in that information may be calculated and displayed for multiple programs for which the information relates. In contrast to Applicant's disclosure, upon viewing the program guide of the '838 Lawler et al patent, a viewer may be aware that a program extends beyond the time limits of the current display but in order to assess the

remaining duration or else the elapsed duration of any particular program, a user must select each program in turn to open a different display, or else must scroll along the time display until the end time before the program can be seen. Such a mode of operation as in the '838 Lawler et al patent is ineffective and troublesome for a user, since the benefit of providing program information within a grid is negated by the need to perform further operations to decide whether or not a particular program is suitable or desirable for viewing. Applicant's invention retains the grid format while providing additional information required by a user such that the user can decide on the suitability of all the programs within the grid at a glance. Therefore, neither the '838 Lawler et al patent or the '748 Matthews III patent, nor any combination of the features therein, result in the method and apparatus of the Applicant's invention.

In addition, the '748 Matthew, III patent and the '838 Lawler et al patent disclose only the possibility of displaying the time remaining in the program being viewed (i.e. the time calculated as the difference between the present time and the end time for the program). Applicant's invention, as currently amended, recites that a display shows the duration for which a given program extends beyond the start or end of the time period shown. Thus, such a time period is calculated from either the start of the time period shown or else the end of the time period shown instead of the current time. The display of this information is particularly beneficial since it can be provided in a format which is compatible with the program grid without confusion to a viewer and without the need to provide explanation of what the time period represents. For example, if the calculation was performed in respect of the present time, the display of such a time period would not be readily understood by a viewer unless an indication was provided of whether the time display was for the elapsed time, or else the remaining time for a program. Given the limited space available for the

display of information within the grid format, the need to provide such information is clearly advantageous. Neither the '838 Lawler et al patent or the '748 Matthews, III patent discuss the problems associated with the display of program durations extending beyond a time period shown using a grid format and, thus, Applicant's invention is not made obvious by the combined disclosures of these cited references.

Applicant believes that the claims as currently amended are novel and non-obvious over the cited references and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

It is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If any further issues remain, a telephone conference with the Examiner is respectfully requested. If there are any charges associated with this amendment, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge such charges to Deposit Account No. 08-1500.

HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN

Respectfully submitted,



Mark G. Kachigian, Registration No. 32,840  
Head, Johnson & Kachigian  
228 West 17th Place  
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119  
(918) 587-2000  
Attorneys for Applicant

Date: 22 December 2004